



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,471	03/09/2004	Leilei Zhang	X-1574 US	2282
24309	7590	05/18/2006	EXAMINER	
XILINX, INC ATTN: LEGAL DEPARTMENT 2100 LOGIC DR SAN JOSE, CA 95124				DIAZ, JOSE R
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PD

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/796,471	ZHANG, LEILEI
	Examiner José R. Diaz	Art Unit 2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-21 and 31 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election of claims 1-21 and 31 in the reply filed on April 17, 2006 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –


(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, 15, 19, 21 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fishley et al. (US Pat. No. 6,654,248 B1).

Regarding claims 1 and 31; Fishley et al. teaches a package lid for attaching to a package substrate of a packaged semiconductor comprising:

a sloped wall (11) configured to provide an exposed perimeter portion (40) of the package substrate (14) when the package lid (10) is disposed on the package substrate (14) to allow application of a molding compound (20) on the exposed perimeter portion

(40) of the package substrate (14), the molding compound (20) contacting the sloped wall (11) to secure the package lid (10) to the package substrate (14) of the packaged semiconductor (22) [see fig. 3, attached below].



Regarding claim 3, Fishley et al. teaches a foot ("foot") around at least a portion of the perimeter of the sloped wall (11), configured to contact the package substrate (14) when the package lid (10) is placed on the package substrate (14) [see figs. 1 and 3].

Regarding claim 4, Fishley et al. teaches the package lid (10) is a stamped package lid [please note that the lid was stamped or cut out to form opening 12. See fig. 3].

Regarding claims 5 and 7, Fishley et al. teaches a thickness of 0.5 mm [see col. 4, lines 1-3].


Regarding claim 8, Fishley et al. further teaches that the package lid comprises nickel-plated copper [see col. 4, lines 4-5].

Regarding claim 9, Fishley et al. further teaches a vent (12).

Regarding claim 10, Fishley et al. further teaches a vent (12) provided on the top side of the package lid (10) [see fig. 3].

Regarding claim 15, Fishley et al. further teaches that the package lid (10) is substantially rectangular [see fig. 1].

Regarding claim 19, Fishley et al. further teaches that the package lid (10) is disposed on the package substrate (14) to provide the exposed perimeter portion and further comprising: first molding compound (M1) applied to a first portion of the exposed perimeter portion (portion of substrate 14 covered with first molding compound M1) and contacting the sloped sidewall (11) [see fig. 3, below], and second molding compound (M2) applied to a second portion of the exposed perimeter portion (portion of substrate 14 covered with first molding compound M2) and contacting the sloped sidewall (11), wherein the first portion of the exposed perimeter portion is opposite the second portion of the exposed perimeter portion [see fig. 3, below].



Regarding claim 21, Fishley et al. teaches the package substrate includes a solder ball-grid array (S1) for connecting the packaged semiconductor to a printed circuit assembly [see fig. 3, above].

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 6, 16, 17 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fishley et al. (US Pat. No. 6,654,248 B1) in view of Tang et al. (US Pat. No. 6,246,115 B1).


Regarding claim 11, Fishley et al. fails to teach a gap in the sloped wall. However, Tang et al. teaches the claimed limitation in figure 2. For instance, Figure 2 shows a gap (321a) in the sloped wall (321) of the package lid (32).

Fishley et al. and Tang et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor as applicant's invention. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a gap in the sloped wall of the package lid taught by Fishley et al. The motivation for doing so, as is taught by Tang et al., is to enforce the bonding between the package lid and the encapsulant (col. 5, lines 7-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tang et al. with Fishley et al. to obtain the invention of claims 11-14.

Regarding claim 2, Fishley et al. teach a sloped wall (11) which appears to be inclined at an angle of less than 90° [see fig. 3]. However, Fishley et al. fails to explicitly teach an angle of between 30° and 60°. Tang et al. appears to show a sloped wall (321) of about 45° [see fig. 2]. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2815

art to include a sloped wall having an angle of between 30° and 60°, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or working ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Huang*, 40 USPQ2d 1685,1688(Fed. Cir. 1996) citing *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233., 235 (CCPA 1955).



Regarding claim 12, Tang et al. teaches a vertical wall (V1) around a top (322) of the package lid (32) [see fig. 2, attached above].

Regarding claim 13, Tang et al. teaches fiducial marks (consider protrusion P1 or 325) formed in the rim (V1) [see fig. 2, attached above].

Regarding claim 14, Tang et al. teaches fiducial marks (325a) formed in corners of a rectangular package lead (32) [see fig. 1].

Regarding claims 6, 16 and 17, it is considered that these claims are *prima facie* obvious without showing that the claimed ranges achieve unexpected results relative to the prior art range. *In re Woodruff*, 16 USPQ2d 1935, 1937 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Huang*, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1688(Fed. Cir. 1996)(claimed ranges of a result effective variable, which do not overlap the prior art ranges, are unpatentable unless they produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art). See also *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA) (discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill of art) and *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955) (selection of optimum ranges within prior art general conditions is obvious).

6. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fishley et al. (US Pat. No. 6,654,248 B1) in view of Yang et al. (US Pat. No. 6,433,420 B1).

Regarding claims 18 and 20, Fishley et al. teaches the exposed perimeter portion (40) of the package substrate (14) in figure 3. However, Fishley et al. fails to teach a package substrate comprising polymer material or an organic resin.

Yang et al. teaches that it is well known in the art to form the package substrate (10) of a polymer material or an organic resin [col. 4, lines 9-11].

Fishley et al. and Yang et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor as applicant's invention. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to form the package substrate taught by Fishley et al. of a polymer material or an organic resin. The motivation for doing so, as is taught by Yang et al., is to enhance the bonding between the package lid and the encapsulant. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yang et al. with Fishley et al. to obtain the invention of claims 18 and 20.

***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José R. Díaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-1727. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Parker can be reached on (571) 272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



José R. Díaz  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2815